



Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

Update on CAEP Accreditation

NYACTE/NYSATE
October 14-16, 2015

Presented by Deborah Eldridge, EdD
CAEP Consultant

A Brief History of US Accreditation

- **Regional/Institutional Accreditation since 1885**
 - New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), includes the six states of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maine, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Vermont and American/international schools in more than sixty nations worldwide
 - Niche accreditors: Bible, theological, rabbinical, distance education, and independent schools.

A Brief History of Specialized and Professional Accreditation

- Since 1905 Council on Medical Education, now American Medical Association (AMA)
- Since 1954--National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)
- Since 1997—Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)
- Currently there are approximately 60 Members of ASPA (Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors)

The Alphabet Soup of Specialty and Professional Accreditation of Teacher Education

- 1952 NCATE, National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education
- 1997 TEAC, Teacher Education Accreditation Council
- 2013 CAEP, Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation unified NCATE and TEAC

Accreditation: Began with **Inputs**

- **Inputs:** library resources, faculty qualifications, courses and syllabi, field hours



Accreditation: Entered a focus on **Outcomes**

- **Outcomes:** satisfaction surveys of employers and graduates; assessment system of candidates' developing knowledge and skills; measures of impact on student learning while in the preparation program.



Accreditation: Now entering a focus on **Evidence-base Quality and Impact**

- **Evidence Quality and Use:** Quality of measures; Comparability; Measures of **student** learning (enhanced emphasis) 1 to 3 years **after** completion of preparation program.



Standards and Components

ST. 1: Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Content Knowledge (Candidates)	ST. 2: Clinical (Candidates and Unit)	ST. 3: SELECTIVITY (Unit)	St. 4: IMPACT (IN-SERVICE and Unit)	St. 5: Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement (Unit)
Knowledge	<i>Partnerships</i>	Recruitment, Diversity, Shortage Areas	IMPACT ON P-12 LEARNING	QA System
<i>Research and Assessment</i>	<i>Clinical educators</i>	ADMISSIONS SELECTIVITY	TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS	<i>Quality of Measures</i>
Alignment with Professional Standards	Clinical Experience	Additional Selectivity	<i>EMPLOYER SATISFACTION</i>	<i>CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT</i>
Impact and Access (Diversity and CCRS)		Selectivity during Program	<i>COMPLETER SATISFACTION</i>	COMPLETER IMPACT
Technology Skills		Selectivity upon Completion		<i>Stakeholder/ Partner Input</i>
		<i>Professional Practice,</i>		

Feedback and Question Pause



Culture of Evidence

- EPPs intentionally and purposefully select evidence that standards are met*
 - Not a compliance model
 - Not a checklist
- CAEP seeks to partner with EPPs in creating a culture of evidence that
 - Encourages and allows for innovation,
 - Asks and answers important questions,
 - Documents what works and does not work, and
 - Bases changes or staying the course on data-driven decisions.

Testing hypotheses and innovations (5.3)

- Test assumptions about EPP's effectiveness through:
 - Collecting and analyzing data,
 - Using assessments that have been validated and field tested
 - Ensuring the inter-rater reliability of the data, and
 - Demonstrating that data have been used appropriately to support conclusions.
- Finding out what does not work is as important as finding out what does work!
 - All the data does not have to be positive
 - Using data to support change is important

Five Big Questions on Assessments*

(aligned with CAEP's Rubric for Assessment)

- What is the purpose and use of the instrument?
- How was the instrument developed?
- What are respondents told about the instrument?
- *Do the instruments require the assessment of higher levels of intellectual behavior (e.g., creating, evaluating, analyzing, applying, etc.)?*
- *Do scoring levels provide distinct levels of candidate performance?*

Assessment Rubrics*

- Why Rubrics?
 - EPPS need to define the criteria used to determine candidate's classroom readiness
 - Define expectations in conjunction with partners
 - Provide on-going and specific feedback to candidates on EPP's performance expectations
 - Minimal level of competency must be defined
 - » Analytical rubric is not required
 - » EPP's can simply define the minimal level for each item on the assessment

Feedback and Question Pause



Evidence by Standard and Component*

- For SI/TI EPPs upload evidence for each standard by its components
- For IB EPPs include their assessments in Appendix “F”
- This process requires multiple data points for each standard
 - EPPs do not have to “meet” each component but must address each component within a standard (exceptions are 3.2; 4.1 through 4.4; 5.3 and 5.4)
 - Having an identified weakness in an area or component is NOT a bad thing
 - How have you used the data to determine that weakness?
 - What are your next steps to address that area of weakness?

First Category of Evidence for Submission – EPP-created Assessments

- Upload any protocols associated with the assessment
- Upload the assessment and the rubric used with the assessment, if applicable
 - Includes any EPP-created assessments such as observation instruments, work samples, lesson or unit plans, surveys.
- Upload a data chart for the submitted assessment
- Provide a narrative about how validity has been or will be established
- Provide a narrative about how reliability has been or will be established

- For IB, Section 3 (methodology), Section 4 (results), Appendices A (Internal Audit), E (Inventory), and F (Assessment Instruments).

Second Category of Evidence – Other Forms of Evidence

- Evidence that is not data related or collected using an instrument of any kind*
 - Minutes from meetings
 - MOU with partners
 - Requirements for various entry points into the program
 - **Portions** of student teaching handbook
 - **Portions** of catalog information
 - Narrative data from focus groups
 - Other types of narrative data

Third Category of Evidence – Proprietary Assessments

- Proprietary Assessments
 - Assessments where an outside agency or company holds the copyright on the assessment
 - State licensure exams
 - edTPA, PPAT, VAM, etc.
 - Other national assessments including surveys
 - For proprietary assessments, EPPs submit the data from the assessment
 - Report validity or reliability data on the assessment as provided by the agency or company
 - Data must be aligned to standard/component

Fourth Category of Data – EPP's Plans

- Any plans submitted by EPPs as evidence during the transition phase-in period
 - 2016-2017 = Plans with evidence of progress
- Applies to:
 - Components 1.4, 3.1, 3.3, 5.3
 - Standard 4 when state data is not available
 - Reliability and Validity

When can plans be submitted in the self-study?

Standard/ Component	Reference	Details
Cmpnt. 1.4	AH pp. 93-94	Phase-in plan for assessments/instruments to demonstrate key criteria for CCRS and performance outcomes
Cmpnt. 2.3	AH p. 96	“Test” of specific facet of placement to gather data on what works
Cmpnt. 3.1	AH p 98	Strategic recruitment plans: need, outreach, numerical goals and baseline, monitoring progress, analyses, changes
Cmpnt. 3.3	AH p. 101	Case study plan demonstrating knowledge of relevant literature about factors selected and predictive validity.
Standard 4	AH p. 84	Plan as part of phase-in when data is not available
Cmpnt. 5.3	AH p. 111	Well-planned “tests” with baseline, intervention, comparison, next steps

Fifth Category of Data – State requirements

- Only applies to EPPs in states that allow the Program Review with Feedback option
- Reviewed by the state representative on the visiting team
- New York State Partnership agreement with CAEP is still in progress

New AIMS Capabilities for SI and TI

- EPPs can submit folders with evidence in each folder
 - One folder can have as many as 10 sub-folders
 - Allows EPPs to organize evidence by folder
 - All evidence is tagged to a specific standard/component
- AIMS will be able to filter the evidence by standard and component
 - Allows EPPs to view how much evidence presented for each component and standard
 - Allows reviewers to filter by components and standards
- There are limits: 90 pieces of evidence of a maximum of 20 MG each

SI template for submitting evidence

- To find the templates for evidence and the self-study report, log into AIMS.
 - aims.caepnet.org
 - Log-in = 24319
 - Password = caep
- From the AIMS main menu on the left-hand side of the screen, click on *Visit Reports* under *Accreditation Process*.
- Make sure the semester is set on **F16** to see the new templates.

IB AIMS interface

- aims.caepnet.org
 - Log-in = 33035
 - Password = caep
- Sandbox is in development

Summary Reflections*

- SI/TE complete a summary reflection for each standard based on the evidence presented
- IB present results in section 4, then discussion/plans in section 5
 - Information is provided from several sources
 - Evidence documents completer proficiencies in content knowledge and pedagogical skills
 - Grades, scores, pass rates and other data are analyzed
 - Differences and similarities across licensure areas, comparisons over time, and demographical data are examined
 - Appropriate interpretations and conclusions are reached
 - Trends or patterns are identified that suggest need for (or success of) preparation modification
 - Based on the analysis of data, planned or completed actions for change are described

What reviewers/auditors/Accreditation Council Members are looking for...

- Reviewers/auditors evaluate the quality and sufficiency of the evidence based on the preponderance of evidence presented.
- All components must be addressed, but not all components have to be met.
- There can be weaknesses in evidence for a component, but overall the standard must be met.
- Decision on whether the standard is met or not is based on the overall strength/quality of the evidence and not its individual components.

Feedback and Question Pause



New CAEP Requirements and Changes

- Continuous Improvement Pathway is now the **Selected Improvement Pathway**
 - All pathways focus on continuous improvement
 - Selected Improvement Plan must reflect an area for improvement based on the data submitted
 - Expectation for SI reviewers –
 - Issue is not that an EPP has identified an area for improvement
 - Judged by how the EPP addresses that area for improvement

New CAEP Requirements and Changes related to SI and TI

- Reviewers provide an analysis of the evidence in the self-study and not a summary of the evidence presented
 - EPPs must make their case to reviewers.
 - Reviewers determine the strength of the evidence supporting the case made by the EPP.
 - Reviewers do not make specific statements about whether or not a standard is met. They provide an analysis of the strength of the evidence for each standard.
 - This is a cultural change for SI/TI EPPs and reviewers.

New Initiatives at CAEP

- Elementary Standards Steering Committee
 - Met in September 2014 and January 2015
 - Meeting in June 2015
 - Draft of new elementary standards has been released and is available on the CAEP website. Go to:
 - http://caepnet.org/standards/k-6-elementary-teacher-standards?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_content=K-6%20Elementary%20Teacher%20Standards&utm_campaign=CAWU_Sept15-Full-List
 - Feedback can be provided through a survey at: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/ZV9TSCZ>

New Initiatives at CAEP

- Advanced Program Standards on CAEP website
 - Timeline for implementation
 - Working group draft to Accreditation Council in October and CAEP board in December
 - Spring 2016-Revisions of draft guidelines based on feedback from the field
 - Summer 2016-Draft of Guidelines for Advanced Standards
 - Fall 2016—Advanced standards process included in the Revised Accreditation Manual
 - Phase-in plan will be similar to the phase-in for initial standards

Advanced Programs Defined

- Programs designed for licensed or certified teachers leading to additional credentials (endorsements, licensures, certifications, or advanced degrees).
- AND
- Programs offered at the graduate level for other school professionals (educational leaders, school counselors, librarians, etc.) who work directly with P-12 students which may or may not require a teaching license for admission.

Litmus test of whether to include a program or not

- Does this advanced program...
 - Have a clear entry point for all candidates?
 - An organized program of study with a progressive and coherent curriculum?
 - Significant, authentic clinical component?
 - Clear exit criteria or culminating experience(s)?
 - Intended to have a direct or indirect impact on P-12 learning?
 - ALWAYS submit: Ed Leadership for P-12 schools; C&I degree programs; MED or MS programs specific to P-12; EdD or PhD specific to P-12

Possible common assessments

- Content specific
 - Professional standards
 - Specialized exam
 - Grades (disaggregated by program)
- Authentic Demonstrations of Problems of Practice
 - Practicum or internship
 - Portfolio
 - Action research or capstone project
- Data collection from graduates/employers
 - Survey
 - Focus groups
 - Interview
 - Document analysis

Accreditation with Advanced Programs

- Advanced Program recommendations of the working group:
 - One self-study with 2 sets of evidence uploads: initial and advanced
 - One accreditation decision that includes initial and advanced program
- **MUST BE APPROVED BY CAEP BOARD in December!!!**

Final Feedback and Question Pause



Proposed New York EPP On-Line Community

- <https://community.caepnet.org>

If interested, speak to your NYACTE/NYSATE
leadership.